

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 have been examined. Claims 1 and 6 have amended. New claims 13-15 have been added. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

**Specification**

In the Office Action, the Examiner requested that the specification at pages 1 and 15 be updated to include the parentage of the application. The specification has been amended to include this information.

The Office Action also requested that the Abstract be amended to recite what is now claimed. The Abstract has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

**Double-Patenting**

Claims 1-12 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double-patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-15 of U.S. Patent No. 5,661,861 in view of Fanto-Chan. Accompanying this Amendment is an appropriate terminal disclaimer, thereby rendering this objection moot.

**Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fanto-Chan or Zenoff in view of Emery or Worchester. This rejection is respectfully traversed in part and overcome in part.

As currently amended, independent claim 1 recites a support pillow that comprises an inflatable pillow body. Further, the pillow body has a medial region and first and second arms that define a generally open well. Further, at least one wall is disposed in the interior to facilitate flattening of the pillow body when it is inflated. This wall is positioned to be generally orthogonal to the open well and also has a height in the range from about 2 inches to about 8 inches.

As recognized in the Office Action, neither Fanto-Chan nor Zenoff describe an inflatable pillow with such a wall. Instead, the Office Action relies upon the Emery and Worchester patents to teach such limitations. However, neither of these references describes placing the wall generally orthogonal to the open well and to provide a height in the range from about 2 inches to about 8 inches. Rather, with the Emery pillow, it does not have a medial region and two arms that define a generally open well. As such, it does not have a wall that is generally orthogonal to the open well. Further, Worchester pillow is a rectangular pillow and therefore does not describe a wall that is generally orthogonal to an open well. Hence, claim 1 which has been amended to include such limitations is distinguishable over the cited art and is in condition for allowance.

Independent claim 6 claims a method for supporting an object in front of a person's torso by utilizing an inflatable pillow body. This pillow body includes a plurality of walls that are spaced apart by about 3 inches to about 10 inches and have a height in the range from about 2 inches to about 8 inches.

As previously described, the Fanto-Chan or Zenoff patents fail to describe an inflatable pillow with such walls. Further, nowhere in the Emery or Worchester patents is there any teaching or suggestion of spacing such walls apart by about 3 inches to about 10 inches and providing them with a height in the range from about 2 inches to about 8 inches. Hence, claim 6 as amended is distinguishable and in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1 and claims 7-12 depend from claim 6. Hence, these are distinguishable for at least depending from an allowable base claim.

#### Added Claims

Claim 13 has been added to depend from claim 1 and claim 14 has been added to depend from claim 6. These claims should be distinguishable for at least the reasons previously recited in connection with claims 1 and 6.

New claim 15 has been added to claim a support pillow that comprises an inflatable pillow body that includes a plurality of walls disposed in the interior to facilitate flattening of the top and bottom sides when the pillow body is inflated. Further, the walls are orthogonal to the well and are spaced apart by about 3 inches to about 10 inches and have a height in the range

Appl. No. 10/748,876  
Amdt. dated December 23, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of September 27, 2004

PATENT


from about 2 inches to about 8 inches. Since the cited art fails to teach or suggest such limitations, claim 15 is also distinguishable and in condition for allowance.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Darin J. Gibby  
Reg. No. 38,464

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: (303) 571-4000  
Fax: (303) 571-4321  
DJG/cl  
60385330 v1